

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/653,224	08/31/2000	Robert C. Mayes	10006908-1	4787	
22879	7590 09/15/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT	HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			NGUYEN, TAN D	
	2400, 3404 E. HARMO		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	UAL PROPERTY ADI INS. CO 80527-2400		3629	TATER NOMBER	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	. /.
Advisory Action	09/653,224	MAYES, ROBERT C.	(3)
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tan Dean D. Nguyen	3629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2004 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to h places the application	o a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offit filmely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Cf.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. Se R 1.136(a) and the appropi ont of the fee. The approp originally set in the final Off	ee MPEP riate extension riate extension fice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simp	olifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed an	nendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT p	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were r	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	_	α	m
		Tan Dean D Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3629	l

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments on pages 3-4 of the response were not persuasive and these issues have been addressed in Office action of 7/12/04 on paragraphs 1, 5, 6. 1. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).